HV 3138 .N3

THE

NATIONAL LEAGUE

FOR THE

PROTECTION

OF THE

FAMILY.

Annual Report for 1898.

THE
National League for the Protection of the Family.

President.

Hon. NATHANIEL SHIPMAN, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.

Vice-Presidents.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, DD., LL.D., Boston.
Pres. SETH LOW, LL.D., New York.
Prof. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Andover.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Recording Secretary.

Rev. C. H. SPALDING, D.D., Boston.

Treasurer.

WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, Esq., 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

Executive Committee.

Prof. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Andover.
Pres. M. H. BUCKHAM, D.D., Burlington, Vt.
Hon. SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.
Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., Cambridge.
Prof. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph.D., Newton Centre.
Rev. JAMES DENORMANDIE, Roxbury.
Prof. ALBION W. SMALL, Ph.D., Chicago.
Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D.D., Worcester.
Hon. CHARLES C. BURR, Auburndale.
EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston.
FRANK GAYLORD COOK, Esq., Cambridge.
Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

REPORT

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

Year Ending December 31, 1898.

BOSTON:
THE EVERETT PRESS COMPANY, PRINTERS,
47 Franklin Street,
1899.

Special Notices.

The Executive Committee ask particular attention to the statement of the Treasurer on page 17. Our contributions, it will be seen, come largely from well-known parties of the highest standing, most of whom have continued their donations for several years. We should double our receipts to meet the present necessities of the treasury. A sketch of the aims, methods, and results of our work is inserted on pages 22 and 23.

Our Reports for 1891 and since, except that for 1895, can be sent to those who apply for them. *The Corresponding Secretary will be grateful for a few copies of the Reports for 1888, 1889, and 1890, for his own use.*

The report of the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, LL.D., Commissioner of Labor, on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe, can be had on application addressed to the Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Associate Annual Membership is invited from those who cannot give large sums. This is freely granted to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of *five dollars* for the year. Such persons become members in full for the time. *If you cannot be a larger contributor, will you not send your request for associate membership, with the fee, and thus share in this work for the Family?*

The Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict, 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, will gratefully acknowledge all contributions sent to him.

Correspondence relating to the work of the League should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, the Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., 113 Hancock Street, Auburndale, Mass. Contributions may also be sent directly to him.

Minutes.

The nineteenth annual meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family, duly called, was held at the Diocesan House, Boston, Jan. 24, 1899, at 2.30 P.M. In the absence of the President, Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., the meeting was called to order by Vice-President Prof. George Harris, D.D., who opened the business with prayer. The minutes of the last annual meeting were read by the Recording Secretary. Dr. S. W. Dike presented the name of Prof. Albion W. Small, Ph.D., of the University of Chicago, for membership, and he was elected. Mr. Frank Gaylord Cook with the Corresponding and the Recording Secretaries were made a committee on nomination of officers. Upon the report of Mr. Cook, the following officers were elected: —

President, Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D.

Vice-Presidents, Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., President Seth Low, LL.D., Prof. George Harris, D.D., LL.D.

Corresponding Secretary, Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D.

Recording Secretary, Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D.

Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict.

Executive Committee, Prof. George Harris, D.D., President M. H. Buckham, D.D., Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D., Rev. James DeNormandie, Prof. Albion W. Small, Ph.D., Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Hon. Charles C. Burr, Mr. Everett O. Fiske, Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D.

The Annual Report of the Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict, was read, and referred to Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., as Auditor.

The Corresponding Secretary submitted his Annual Report, portions of which were read and commented upon, after which it was accepted and ordered printed and distributed at the discretion of Dr. Dike.

After some informal remarks as to stimulating interest in the work of the League, it was voted to adjourn.

C. H. SPALDING,
Recording Secretary.

Boston, Mass., Jan. 24, 1899.

Report of Corresponding Secretary.

Prof. W. Z. Ripley, printing in the *Popular Science Monthly* of last February a recent Lowell Institute lecture, said: "The organization of the Family is the surest criterion of the stage of social evolution attained by a people. No other phase of human association is so many-sided, so fundamental, so pregnant for the future."

The late President, Mark Hopkins, wrote: "In my view the continuance of our institutions depends on the purity, the sacredness, and the well-ordering of Families. Have what public schools you may, enlighten the people as you may, and without the Family as formative, and as offering in its spirit the only model of a right government, the permanence of free institutions in any such form as to make them a blessing is impossible."

And our own first President, Dr. Theodore D. Woolsey, having specially in mind our political institutions, of which he was a great expounder, also said: "Whether we are to be a thoroughly Christian Nation or to decay and lose our present political forms depends on our ability to keep Family life pure and simple."

PATRIOTISM AND THE FAMILY.

If these statements are correct, and I believe it yet remains for any thinker and scholar to dispute their truthfulness, then Patriotism — a word due to the historical relation of the Nation to the Family — is in the last analysis even more dependent upon the Family than it is on either the political or the military arms of the government.

The war of the past year has made some things clear that bear on this subject. The intelligence and morality of the man behind the gun determine the efficiency of the weapon. The unselfishness, the noble ideals and high devotion of citizens in private and in official station, make an army and navy effective. Their lack weakens the arms of the Nation, taints its supplies, and unnerves the bravest of soldiers. A great people must have certain fundamental virtues. These are such as reverence, love of truth and righteousness, docility, honesty in thought and conduct, the habit of justice, unselfishness, quick and full response to all calls of duty, and the power to do present work in the light of the future. The civic and military achievements of a people, the prosperity and security of their busi-

ness, the success of their schools and churches, closely depend upon these basic virtues.

The Family, even beyond either Church or School, — if this kind of comparison of organically related institutions be for the moment admissible, — is the one institution that supplies the State with these virtues. It is to the Family that we look for their beginning. It is in the Family that they can be most wisely nourished into strength, and it is in the Home that Church and School must seek for the laboratory where their own instruction can be made efficient by being worked into the very being of the young. No work, then, is more important or should more command the thought and effort of all patriotic citizens than that which concerns the Family. The national flag over the Home in time of peace, if we stop to think of it carefully, would be a still more appropriate and significant token of patriotism than its presence in time of war is, for it would bear witness to the deep and abiding relations that exist between our country and our homes.

THE MEANING OF SUCH WORK.

This, then, is the meaning of the work of the National League for the Protection of the Family. It is a witness to the important place of the Family among our social institutions, whether they are those of government, industry, education, or philanthropy. To protect and improve the Family is to serve the State, the Church, the School, and every industrial interest.

There are two chief directions which such a work, in order to be complete, must take: that aimed at the Family itself, its structure and content, and that which is concerned with the relations of the Family — especially to other institutions. Under the first of these heads come such subjects as Marriage, Divorce, Chastity, and the licentious vices and other conditions affecting the Home itself. Under the second we have, on the one hand, such matters as the service which the State, the School, and the business of the country should render to the Home; and on the other, the securing from the Home of its full contribution to these other institutions.

ITS RECOGNITION.

Here is an object worthy of the best efforts and the most generous expenditures of our people. Government has shown its appreciation by giving us its service in investigation, in putting our suggestions into law, and in the creation of commissions on uniform legislation. The universities, colleges, theological seminaries, and normal schools have taken up the study of the Family, and now make it part of their

regular courses. Among leaders the Home is recognized as a practical factor of first importance in the problems of churches and schools, and in reforms that deal with crime, poverty, insanity, intemperance, and licentiousness. The immediate need now is for general popular recognition, which must come largely through the press and pulpit. For a long time the thought of the people has not been turned to the Family and its needs in any degree commensurate with the attention that has been given to other institutions, nor with its importance. But this must soon be changed. It will indeed be a happy event if it can be done before some social disaster forces us to turn to the Home for the repair of the very tissue of our national life.

If the League is to hold only the outpost of this coming movement, let us be faithful to our duty. When some stronger force can relieve us and cover the field, let us be ready to retire. Until then we cannot desert the field without disloyalty to our country.

SPECIAL DIFFICULTIES IN 1898.

With the growing appreciation of the need and value of our work, with a better name for the League, and with returning financial prosperity in the country, it was our hope to recover, as we had done once before, from the losses in receipts of former years. A generous conditional offer was made by one of our officers toward the payment of the debt. But the coming and presence of the war unsettled everything and made both collections and work difficult. It was soon clear that we must do what we could in both directions, and wait for better times. Our receipts for 1898 were nearly ten per cent less than those for the former year. But in the last three months they were over twenty per cent more than they were in the last quarter of 1897, and our present debt of $1,236.41 is only a little larger than the one we readily paid off ten years ago.

The number of contributors during the year is larger than in either of the two preceding years. Some unsolicited contributions, with generous words of appreciation, have come from persons of high standing as authorities in their departments of social study.

The occupation of the public mind by the war and its issues has restricted our work also. The supply of special papers is now nearly exhausted, and we cannot venture upon printing more until we have more money for the purpose. The change in name, however, involved some special expense in printing, and the increase of correspondence added to our postage bill. This correspondence represents a good deal of important work by which the interest of ministers, writers, teachers, students, legislators, and other public-spirited citizens is assisted to practical and often far-reaching results at a small pecuniary expense.

THE STUDY OF THE FAMILY.

The correspondence of the year shows a marked interest in the study of the Family in almost all directions. The work in three of the best Universities of the West that has come more fully to our knowledge by correspondence the past year may be cited in evidence. In one the professor in charge writes of having large classes of one hundred and fifty in Sociology, where much work is done on the Family, and says that "instruction in Family economics and hygiene is given by the women's Dean." He says, "I can scarcely understand how it is that there is so little solid literature on the Family, except anthropological works dealing with the remote past."

The second of these institutions has developed still more fully than ever its work on the Family. It now offers by correspondence an elaborate course of forty studies in the Family. Our reports and papers are in frequent use in this and the regular courses of the University, and are recommended in one or more text-books published by the Faculty. In consequence of this, many inquiries for papers, suggestions, and advice from several adjoining States have recently come to us. These, of late, are chiefly from the Principals of Normal Schools and their students, and from Social Science Clubs. Another new source of inquiry the last year is the High School in some New England towns.

In the third University the large and well-organized Department of History and Social Science gives much attention to the Family, and the Head Professor has been at work three or four years on what is likely to be, when published a year or two hence, the book on the Modern Family for which many are looking to meet a great need. A professor from a fourth University — this one in the East — sent for our examination and suggestions the outline of his course on the Family. All these are great Universities, reaching the people in the central and western parts of the country, and this has been going on for more than a dozen years in one part of the country or another.

IN PRACTICAL RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL WORK.

Typical illustrations may be given of the growing sense of the value of Family life as a centre of efforts at social reform, all taken from the incidents of the last year. One was an invitation to address a club composed of the salaried workers in New England charitable associations for various social efforts. Another is a request for addresses in an influential city, before a conference of some of its best churches, and to one of its men's clubs, and for information regarding the Home, from the President of the City Missionary Society, whose

officers had come to see that the Home must become the subject of more attention in their work. The interest of the conference was such that at its next meeting another half-day will be given to the subject. That city may be expected to show good results. A third was the appeal for help from Maine, where the recent increase of divorce has brought fresh alarm to some of its people, the divorces being in one year as many as 1 to 8.4 of the marriages celebrated in the year, and in another 1 to 8.2. Addresses were given in Saco before the Maine Conference of Congregational Churches, at Bowdoin College and Bangor Seminary, and in churches in Bangor and Portland. Two other colleges would have been visited had they been fairly at work when the trip was made early in the autumn. Other instances might be cited of a growing conviction during the year that the churches are awakening to their needs in this direction.

THE HOME DEPARTMENT OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL.

This practical application of the principles that underlie our work has probably attracted more attention and made more growth the past year than in any year before. A special literature of its own, discussions of its principles and methods, are now coming to be common everywhere. Several Sunday-school societies now issue a Home Department Quarterly, and some interesting statistics are being gathered which show the value of this effort to get people who are unable or unwilling to attend a public service to enter upon Bible study at home. The simplicity of the plan, its non-interference with other forms of religious work, its tendency to send those who begin at home to the church and its school, its aid to pastors and others in giving knowledge of people hitherto hard to reach, and its opening of the eyes of many to the possibility of other uses to be made of the Home itself in religious and educational effort, are coming to be appreciated. We still have some copies of a reprint of a recent paper on the origin and principles of the Home Department, but for general information and other ordinary literature application should be made to the Sunday-school societies that have taken up the subject. Only let us say further that pastors and other leaders should see that its fundamental aim to awaken the Home to religious activity be not obscured in the zeal to build up the Sunday-school. The Home Department should point the way to other and better things.

A DANGER.

The concentration of the energies of a church in its central place of meeting with a multiplication of various organizations for doing religious work there, together with a less numerous, less vigorous, less

homogeneous population in out-lying districts, creates a danger that menaces both Church and society. The disuse and the defective use of the Home are, I think, a more serious evil than its corruption by vice and its dissolution by divorce.

A single fact will show how serious this neglect by the Church has already become in some parts of New England. The Corresponding Secretary of the Vermont Convention of Congregational Churches, in answers from one hundred and seven churches to the specific question, found that "much the greater part reply that nothing is being done outside the services of the house of worship." There is reason to fear that this neglect of the Home and neighborhood is on the increase almost everywhere, especially in country districts; and but for the Home Department of the Sunday-school there would be, as in Vermont, a still larger number of those doing nothing outside church walls in the way of definite religious work. We have called attention to this danger constantly, and some pastors are facing it bravely.

IN EDUCATION AND SOCIAL IMPROVEMENT.

The interest of the last two or three years in the effort to bring the Home and School into closer and more intelligent co-operation continues unabated where it has once been awakened. I think it is growing. I have been in consultation with educators, to some extent, regarding it the past year. The better adjustment of the work of the Home, the Public School, and the Sunday-school or Church to each other is apparently to be one of the educational problems of the early future. At present educational authorities show more interest in the subject than is to be found in ecclesiastical quarters. Conference between the managers and teachers of public schools and pastors and other religious teachers, and those who can best represent the interests of the Home, ought to lead to valuable practical results. At present Church, School, and Home, if not actually at cross-purposes with each other, certainly fail of an intelligent, scientific co-operation in their common work of forming character. The field of popular education as a whole needs survey, division, and systematic cultivation by the various educational forces acting in intelligent adjustment to each other. When this is attempted the Home will be sure to get a place that it has not had under our past public and Sunday-school system.

UNIFORM LEGISLATION.

Those who have followed this subject carefully are aware that our League was the means of bringing together, in 1890, the Committee of the American Bar Association on Uniform Legislation and the Commission which had been established that year in New York for

the promotion of Uniformity. We had already, to a considerable extent, prepared the way for this work by securing the official Report of our Government on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe. We also joined in the movement to lead the States and Territories generally to appoint Commissioners.

Thirty-two States and one Territory have now entered in this way upon this important work, which is one of much difficulty and must be of necessity a slow one. In order to make the beginning easy and to interest the public, subjects of a commercial nature, or of pecuniary interest in other ways, were first taken up. The Commissioners have now found themselves able to give more attention to Marriage and Divorce, which occupied much of the time of the last Annual Meeting of the Conference.

TENTATIVE MEASURES.

The Conference now has before it a simple act designed to secure uniformity in procedure. In view of considerable disagreement among the Commissioners and of the difficulties besetting other parts of the subject, they have not formally recommended even their draft of a statute on procedure, but publish a mere fragment of it as a step toward further action at the next Conference. We copy it entire, except the enacting clause, but including the prefatory statement regarding the causes of divorce: —

AN ACT TO ESTABLISH A LAW UNIFORM WITH THE LAWS OF OTHER STATES RELATIVE TO DIVORCE PROCEDURE.

[The causes of divorce are to be left to the several States to provide as now; that being a subject in which, in the judgment of the Commissioners, uniformity of law throughout the whole country is not practicable, perhaps not desirable.]

Enacting Clause.

SECTION 1. No person shall be entitled to a divorce who has not had an actual, continuous, and *bona fide* residence in this State two years next before bringing suit, nor unless the defendant shall have been personally served with process, or shall have voluntarily appeared in such action or proceeding, except as in the next section provided.

SEC. 2. If it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Court, or any judge thereof in vacation, that the defendant is a non-resident at the time divorce is applied for, and that the cause of action arose at the time he or she was domiciled in the State, and that the defendant has been absent from the State for the space of one year, such Court or judge may authorize notice of the pendency of the suit to be given by publication in such manner as may be provided by law.

SEC. 3. No divorce shall be granted upon admissions of the defendant, express, or implied by the pleadings.

SEC. 4. After absolute divorce either party may marry again; but no decree for absolute divorce shall be finally entered or become operative until (———) months after hearing and decision upon the petition.

The Conference also publishes a proposed law, which some States already have found it necessary to make, forbidding the advertisement of the procuring of Divorces. It is surprising that all the better class of newspapers have not, as many of them have always done, entirely excluded this species of advertising from their columns in the interest of public morality, without waiting to have it made illegal.

COMITY BETWEEN STATES AND CHURCHES.

A section seems to have been adopted in the Conference that if enacted would make general the law which Delaware made a few years ago. It reads: "No divorce shall be granted in this State for any cause which is not a ground of divorce in the State where the cause arose." This provision, while it in no way interferes with the rights of citizens in their own State, simply makes other States refuse them what their own State denies to them and thus acts upon a principle of comity.

It would be well if Churches also should follow this principle, if they are not willing to lead the way in adopting it; or there is serious and frequent complaint on the part of some ministers and churches that they cannot maintain their own standard regarding Divorce, because of the readiness of others, having less restricted rules or convictions, to celebrate the marriage of persons who could not be married within their own Communion. While such a practice of unity should probably have its limitations in actual operation, the principle of it seems to be a sound one. The Church, certainly, should by its own rules encourage the State, rather than the reverse. Your Secretary incorporated this suggestion in a brief Report to the National Council of Congregational Churches last summer.

STATE LEGISLATION.

As in the great majority of the States no sessions of the Legislature were held in 1898, there is little to report under this head. Only two or three acts were passed relating to Marriage or Divorce. Massachusetts makes further provision for notice to the adverse party in a Divorce case and for permitting a person charged with being *particeps criminis* to appear and contest the case, when adultery is charged. New Jersey strengthens its new Marriage law by an act imposing a fine on clergymen or others who celebrate the marriage of non-residents who have not obtained the required license. The practice in Delaware of going to the Legislature for Divorces, where they seem to be easily granted, appears to be on the increase. There were 102 Divorces granted at the biennial session of 1897, against 49 in 1895.

It is hoped that the attempt to restrict the granting of Divorce to the courts will soon be renewed and prove successful.

MOVEMENTS BEGUN.

Several hopeful movements for legal reform have come to our notice through correspondence with parties interested in reform. The clergy and lawyers of Kansas City began a co-operative work year before last, such as we always recommend. This resulted the past year in the submission to the Missouri State Bar Association of the action of the Bar Association of Kansas City, where the movement apparently began, and which met the approval of the Committee of the State Association. The whole subject is probably before the Legislature of this year. The committee declare that hasty and ill-advised marriages, with lax and carelessly administered Divorce laws, are evils that support each other. Among the measures recommended are restriction upon Divorces of non-residents, upon the re-marriage of guilty parties, and the making of all Divorces provisional in the first instance, but convertible into absolute Divorce after a fixed period.

In North Dakota, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Indiana there are also similar evidences of activity, and in North Dakota the Senate has already passed a bill raising the time of residence to one year before a Divorce can be granted. The friends of reform in South Dakota are on the alert to defeat a threatened effort to repeal or amend in the interests of laxity the improved Divorce laws of that State. But there can be little probability that South Dakota, after seeing several of the newer States and Territories follow her in raising the time of residence before a Divorce is granted, will herself be the first to turn back to the former disgracefully short term of ninety days, especially as nearly all the improved legislation on the subjects of Marriage and Divorce has so far come to stay.

DIVORCE AND DESERTION AMONG THE POOR.

Several years ago we called attention to the abuses by the lower classes of the laws permitting Divorce for desertion or neglect to support one's family. The number of instances of this kind, especially if we include those cases of desertion where Marriage to other parties takes place without Divorce at all, constituting bigamy, must be enormously large, and become a serious menace to society. Some of these cases are reached by statutory or other laws, making the failure to support one's family, when able to do so, a crime. But in many instances the deserting husband flees to another State and puts himself beyond the reach of the law.

So many instances of this kind have come to the notice of the

Legal Aid Society, of New York, in the course of its admirable work of giving legal aid to the poor, that a special committee of the society is giving the subject its attention. This society tell us that they have also discovered a practice, among certain Jewish rabbis in the thickly settled Eastern portions of the city, of granting Divorces by their own ecclesiastical authority. This is a transfer to our country, I suppose, of a practice entirely legal among the Jews in Russia. The President of the Legal Aid Society on investigation found "that in hundreds and possibly thousands of instances this same kind of crime is being inflicted upon innocent women and helpless children." And in this connection he points to the apparent need of something in this country like the obligatory civil marriage of Europe, which enables the authorities to know the legal standing of all persons assuming conjugal relations, and saves the State from a vast deal of crime which our laws openly invite or make possible. At present the proper way of meeting the difficulty is not clear. Our League will continue to watch and if possible aid in this movement. It should be added that the Legal Aid Society prevents many Divorces by compelling men to support their families. Some laws recently enacted in various States to reach this class of men seem to be working well.

IMMIGRANTS OF UNKNOWN CONJUGAL CONDITION.

Complaint is not infrequently made that our great cities and manufacturing centres are constantly receiving from England and elsewhere immigrants who come to us and contract marriages with innocent women and young girls, having deserted a wife and children in the old country for this very purpose. This evil points to the need of further restrictions in our immigration laws, as well as to the weakness in our own system which makes possible the same practice among our native citizens. It would seem a great gain if all immigrants should be required to produce papers showing their conjugal relations at the time of leaving their own country, and that the facts be made a matter of official record in the cities or towns where they come to reside. Probably it would be more difficult to adopt a similar measure regarding the conjugal condition of those of our own people who move from one city or State to another. The evils that come from its lack, however, can hardly be doubted, for bigamy is probably more easily practised, perhaps more frequently, than in any other civilized country. The polygamists of our country are by no means confined to the regions controlled by Mormons.

THE GREAT NEED.

Every year, and as our work goes on, it becomes more clear that the great evils that assault the structure of the Family, such as polygamy, unwise marriages, needless divorces, and the various sexual vices, must be reached by an improved public opinion as well as by law. Spasmodic efforts at legal reform, popular crusades against some flagrant offence against decency, may have their value; but when their immediate occasion passes those who engage in them are too apt to forget the long and arduous task that remains, — that of removing the roots of the special evil and cleansing the soil in which it grows. It is a healthier public sentiment that is most needed. Ephemeral interest alone is little more than mischievous.

Then, as already said in this Report, the Family probably suffers more from its inadequate or improper use than from any, if not all, the evils that assail its structure. The substitution of the club, the saloon, the shop, the society, the School, and even the Church for the Home, and the consequent neglect of the Home, create the greatest and the most subtle danger to the Home. If the Home is not encouraged to do its own work it will lose its ability to work and fall an easy prey to the specious plea for other agencies to take its place.

But reform must begin, not where the evils are the worst, but where the greatest recuperative forces are to be found. By her professed position at the head of social life, it therefore becomes the duty of the Church, and, next to the Church, of the School, to refuse to provide substitutes for the work of the Home, until reasonable efforts are made to get the Home to attend to its own divinely appointed work. Many churches are doing the Home a great injury by the thoughtless way in which they concentrate their efforts in behalf of the Home upon measures to make up for the deficiencies in Home training by various means of a public nature, while they do not give any corresponding attention to the quickening of the Home itself. Happily, in no year of our League have so many evidences of a growing sense of the need of more work through the Home come to us as in the past year. The clergy are increasingly alive to this need, and have called for aid more frequently than in former years.

CONTROLLING PRINCIPLES.

The League, then, is founded first on the conviction that certain evils are far too prevalent which either threaten the existence or impair the constitution of the Family; that the Family has received inadequate protection and care from State and Church and from Educational and Industrial interests; and that the Family has not been

made that positively constructive force in social life that it should be. Secondly, this state of the Family is largely the outgrowth of historical conditions of European civilization, which our country has inherited in a peculiar degree, so that the great social movement of our day and our problem of the Family are inseparably connected. This was the main proposition of the lecture of the day the League was organized, Jan. 24, 1881. Though novel then, it is now the widely accepted principle of our best Schools of Sociology — all of which have come into being since that time.

Thirdly, these convictions regarding the nature of the problem and its underlying causes carried with it certain other conclusions as to its treatment. The method must be scientific as well as practical. Unintelligent sentiment, attacks upon evils at random, movements whose relations to the larger parts of the subject are not thoroughly studied, would be out of place in a work like ours. Facts must be ascertained by competent investigators, their causes carefully examined, and their value in relation to the social whole understood. The task, under this method, has been the exact reverse of the methods of many societies; for it must not be our aim to find out how many things the League itself can do, but to discover ways of getting others to do as many as possible of the things that need to be done.

THE SUCCESS OF THE METHOD.

That our Reports have often appeared to tell more of the work of other people than of our own is an evidence of the success of our method. The co-operation of governments in our plans for investigation and legislation, the opening of Universities, Colleges, and professional schools for our lectures, and their own introduction of the study of the Family and its incidents, the scientific literature regarding the Family,— nearly all of it the creation of the years included within our own history,— and the testimony of such men as Bryce, Gladstone, Mulford, Woolsey, Hopkins, and many others to the gravity of the situation or the fundamental nature of the problem itself, and the practical results already secured, — all these go to show that the founders of the League were not mistaken in their judgment of its need and method. The testimony of the head of one of the most important departments of Sociology in any University in the country, in a private letter written a year or two ago, said of this work of the League: "If I am any prophet, it will be more widely known and more highly appreciated a hundred years hence than it is to-day." The Hon. Carroll D. Wright, LL.D., has repeatedly commended its work in his public lectures as an example of a good method in social reform.

THE IMMEDIATE NEED.

This is to give the League a support that shall be worthy of its object and the great fundamental institution of society for which it stands. If this work has come to stay, as we believe, let it be dignified by a proper support. Let those who believe in the Family as one of the most important social institutions, which should be protected and developed as carefully as we do the Church, the School, and the Municipality, refuse to push the one society in the country that stands for it into the background when appeals for its support come to them. Let benevolent persons say, "This work must have even special attention until it is honored as it deserves to be."

There is not a missionary nor a philanthropic society of any kind which is not dependent upon the Home for its own life and vigor. There is not one which is not suffering from the waste of life and money in the courts, in prisons, in almshouses, in saloons, and in social extravagances of all sorts, because home life is destroyed, or corrupt, or feeble. There is not one which would not be vastly benefited by the increase of care for the Home. In many churches the Home Department of the Sunday-school is already turning into the treasury more than its cost. Get the Home to do a little Bible study by itself, and it soon begins to give money to the Church. So, within proper limits, the more the Home learns to do for itself, the more it will contribute to social welfare in general.

The Home is the birthplace of the Nation. It is also the seat of its life and power. The constant renewal of national life must go on in the Home, or the Nation decays. The first duty of the patriot, whether as citizen, church member, man of business, educator, or philanthropist, is to the Home. The dire necessities of war, the days of stress and storm in politics and business, need not alarm us if the Home life has been all it should be. The work of the Church and the School will succeed so long as they can depend upon the Home to receive and multiply their influence.

Whether, then, we look at the place the Family holds in the work of human society, or consider its needs from the evils that assail it, or examine its slumbering powers, or reflect upon the singular neglect which the Church has shown toward it in her absorption in other ways of doing her work, we are compelled to the conclusion that it is in need of our thought, our effort, and our money, as almost no other institution can possibly be.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,
Corresponding Secretary.

Treasurer's Report.

WM. G. BENEDICT, *Treasurer*,

In account with the National League for the Protection of the Family.

DR.		CR.	
Dec. 31, 1898.		Dec. 31, 1898.	
To Receipts from Contributions for the year 1898, as per details in Cash Book . . .	$2,078.50	By Disbursements for the year 1898, as per Cash Book:	
		General Expenses,—	
		Travelling	$182.99
		Postage	72.18
		Advertising, Express, Help, Clippings, etc.	18.40
		Printing	131.90
		Stationery	12.50
		Rent	50.00
		Paid on Account of Salary of Secretary	1,610.53
	$2,078.50		$2,078.50
		MEMORANDA.	
		Due the Secretary, Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D., Dec. 31, 1895	$356.17
		Deficiency in 1896	341.89
		" 1897	148.88
		" 1898	389.47
			$1,236.41

Account audited by FRANK G. COOK, Jan. 26, 1899.

CONTRIBUTIONS.

Jan.	3.	Rev. W. H. Moore, Hartford, Ct.	$3 00
	3.	Rt. Rev. H. A. Neely, D.D., Portland, Me. . . .	5 00
	6.	Pres. Seth Low, LL.D., New York	50 00
	13.	Prof. William M. Sloane, LL.D., New York . . .	5 00
	14.	Col. Jacob L. Greene, Hartford, Ct.	35 00
	15.	State Street Cong. Church, Portland, Me.	25 00
	15.	Union Church, Providence, R. I.	10 00
	22.	Mrs. Theodore D. Woolsey, New Haven, Ct. . .	50 00

Jan.	24.	Rt. Rev. Leighton Coleman, D.D., Wilmington, Del.	$3 00
	25.	Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H.	5 00
	26.	First Congregational Church, Pawtucket, R. I.	25 00
		Received in January	$216 00
Feb.	2.	Charles King, Washington, D. C.	$5 00
	3.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester (in part)	25 00
	10.	Old South Church, Boston	25 00
	11.	Hon. W. E. Dodge, New York	100 00
	11.	James C. Braman, Auburndale	10 00
	11.	Rev. Walter Glynne, Summit, N. J.	1 00
	11.	Hon. Jonathan A. Lane, Boston	5 00
	11.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	5 00
	12.	Rev. C. W. Huntington, Lowell	5 00
	12.	Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D., Hartford, Ct.	25 00
	12.	Prof. Henry W. Farnham, New Haven, Ct.	25 00
	12.	Charles E. Ranlett, Auburndale	5 00
	14.	Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00
	14.	Rev. George E. Johnson, Burlington, Vt.	5 00
	14.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale	3 00
	15.	St. Ann's Church Missionary Society, Brooklyn, N.Y.	5 00
	15.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence	10 00
	16.	Pres. Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington, D.C.	5 00
	16.	Rev. George M. Adams, D.D., Auburndale	5 00
	16.	George B. Knapp, Boston	10 00
	17.	Prof. Alexander R. Merriam, Hartford, Ct.	2 00
	17.	Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y.	10 00
	17.	Anson Phelps Stokes, New York	5 00
	18.	Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D., St. Louis	5 00
	18.	Rev. Daniel L. Furber, D.D., Newton Centre	2 00
	19.	George Burnham, Philadelphia	25 00
	21.	Robert H. Gardiner, Chestnut Hill	5 00
	23.	J. N. Denison, Boston	25 00
	24.	Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D., Cambridge	3 00
	25.	The Very Rev. E. A. Hoffman, D.D., LL.D., New York	25 00
	26.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00
	28.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00
	28.	St. John's Church, Washington, D. C.	15 00
		Received in February	$436 00
Mar.	2.	Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D., Newton Centre	$5 00
	4.	Hon. Charles C. Burr, Auburndale	40 00
	5.	William G. Benedict, Boston	25 00
	5.	Prof. E. Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover	5 00
	7.	Robert C. Ogden, Philadelphia	25 00
	7.	W. C. Whittemore, Washington, D. C.	5 00
	7.	Rev. James R. Edwards, Norwich, N. Y.	1 00
	7.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D. D., Auburndale	10 00
	7.	Dr. George B. Faulkner, Jamaica Plain	5 00
	8.	St. Bartholomew's Church, New York	100 00
	10.	Rev. J. F. Fielden, Winchendon	2 00
	10.	Rev. John W. Buckham, Salem	3 00
	10.	Rev. William Prall, D.D., Detroit	3 00

	10.	Prof. C. W. Henderson, D.D., Chicago	$1 00	
	14.	Rev. A. M. Merwin, Pasadena, Cal.	3 00	
	15.	"L. H. W.," Boston	10 00	
	22.	Rev. W. W. Davis, D.D., Newton	5 00	
	22.	Hon. W. P. Ellison, Newton	5 00	
	24.	Rev. Alexander H. Vinton, D.D., Worcester	10 00	
	25.	Pres. G. Stanley Hall, LL.D., Worcester	5 00	
	25.	Rev. G. H. Gould, D.D., Worcester	5 00	
	28.	Prof. Dean A. Walker, Ph.D., Aurora, N. Y.	5 00	
		Received in March		$278 00
April	7.	Rev. Edward M. Chapman, Worcester	$5 00	
	8.	Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain	5 00	
	9.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham	10 00	
	12.	William S. Price, Philadelphia	5 00	
	13.	Rev. S. W. Dana, D.D., Philadelphia	5 00	
	13.	Rev. Henry Clay Trumbull, D.D., Philadelphia	5 00	
	13.	Stuart Wood, Philadelphia	10 00	
	20.	C. W. Wilder, Newton	10 00	
	21.	Wingate P. Sargent, Melrose	5 00	
	25.	Miss A. E. Tower, Cambridge	1 00	
	25.	Hon. Robert Treat Paine, Boston	5 00	
	26.	James Schouler, Boston	5 00	
	29.	Rev. Arthur Lawrence, D.D., Stockbridge	20 00	
		Received in April		$91 00
May	4.	Hon. S. B. Capen, Boston	$10 00	
	6.	Rev. Charles M. Southgate, Auburndale	5 00	
	6.	For Expenses for Address, Philadelphia	26 50	
	10.	Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D., D. C. L., New York	25 00	
	17.	Rev. W. P. Alcott, Boxford	5 00	
	19.	Hon. C. C. Conant, Greenfield	2 00	
	28.	Rev. Francis Goodwin, Hartford, Ct.	20 00	
	28.	Richard H. Dana, Jr., Cambridge	5 00	
	31.	Messrs. Funk and Wagnalls, New York	10 00	
		Received in May		$108 50
June	3.	Rev. W. P. Elkins, Peterboro, N. H.	$2 25	
	6.	N. Noyes, Whitman	1 00	
	6.	George Ripley, Andover	10 00	
	9.	St. Ann's Church, Lowell	25 00	
	10.	Rev. W. Spooner Smith, Auburndale	5 00	
	23.	Edwin Ginn, Winchester	10 00	
	23.	South Congregational Church, Springfield	15 00	
		Received in June		$68 25
July	8.	Rev. Edward C. Porter, Watertown	$5 00	
	9.	Rev. G. L. Demarest, D.D., Manchester, N. H.	5 00	
		Received in July		$10 00
Aug.	11.	J. Howard Nichols, Newton	$5 00	
	12.	Rev. Cornelius H. Patten, St. Louis	5 00	
		Received in August		$10 00

Sept.	9.	Rev. Horace Dutton, Auburndale	$5 00	
	22.	Pres. W. De Witt Hyde, LL.D., Brunswick, Me., additional	5 00	
	26.	Rev. and Mrs. Henry L. Griffin, Bangor, Me.	10 00	
	26.	Rev. John S. Penman, Bangor, Me.	5 00	
	26.	Central Congregational Church, Bangor, Me.	8 00	
	27.	Rev. George M. Steele, D.D., Chicago	5 00	
		Received in September		$38 00
Oct.	6.	Rev. Edward R. Stearns, Warren, Me.	$5 00	
	6.	Samuel Johnson, Boston	10 00	
	6.	Rev. George M. Adams, D.D., Auburndale	5 00	
	10.	Prof. Waldo S. Pratt, Hartford Ct.	5 00	
	12.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Ct.	50 00	
	12.	Hon. F. J. Kingsbury, LL.D., Waterbury, Ct.	25 00	
	12.	Rev. John G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury, Ct.	6 00	
	12.	Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Ct.	5 00	
	12.	Rev. J. W. Cooper, D.D., New Britain, Ct.	5 00	
	17.	"B. B.," New York	25 00	
	17.	Mrs. John S. Mitchell, Waterbury, Ct.	50 00	
	19.	Rufus B. Fowler, Worcester	10 00	
	21.	Miss Elizabeth H. Houghton, Cambridge	25 00	
	29.	William B. Herrick, Auburndale	10 00	
		Received in October		$236 00
Nov.	2.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester, balance	$25 00	
	3.	Mrs. J. S. Brigham, Worcester	10 00	
	4.	Rev. Parris T. Farwell, Wellesley Hills	5 00	
	10.	St. John's Church, Providence	25 00	
	10.	Rev. J. H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00	
	10.	Rev. John C. Perkins, Portland, Me.	5 00	
	10.	Rev. Henry Blanchard, D.D., Portland, Me.	5 00	
	18.	Francis B. Sears, Boston	5 00	
	19.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Ct.	50 00	
	21.	Mrs. W. E. Dodge, Sr., New York	10 00	
	21.	Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, New York	20 00	
	21.	Prof. John Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover	5 00	
	21.	Rev. F. W. Greene, Middletown, Ct.	5 00	
	21.	Rev. A. W. Hazen, D.D., Middletown, Ct.	5 00	
	21.	Prof. W. W. Atwater, Middletown, Ct.	5 00	
	21.	Prof. N. W. Rice, Middletown, Ct.	5 00	
	21.	W. G. Vermilye, Middletown, Ct.	5 00	
	21.	Church Collection, Middletown, Ct.	5 75	
	25.	"J. H. W.," New York	20 00	
	26.	W. W. Lockwood, Detroit	5 00	
		Received in November		$230 75
Dec.	5.	First Baptist Church, Worcester	$5 00	
	5.	Dr. Charles A. Peabody, Worcester	10 00	
	7.	Anson Phelps Stokes, New York	10 00	
	8.	Rev. J. H. De Forrest, D.D., Sendai, Japan	5 00	
	8.	Gardiner S. Allis, Worcester	3 00	
	9.	"A Vermont Lady"	50 00	

Dec.	9.	Col. C. A. Hopkins, Brookline	$10 00
	9.	E. P. Dutton, New York	10 00
	9.	Rev. W. W. Atterbury, D.D., New York	5 00
	9.	"A Member," Eliot Church, Newton	5 00
	9.	A. C. Tenney, Chelsea	2 00
	9.	Rev. Theodore T. Munger, D.D., New Haven, Ct.	5 00
	10.	Coolidge S. Roberts, Cambridge	20 00
	12.	Hon. Lyman D. Brewster, Danbury, Ct.	5 00
	12.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale	2 00
	12.	Hon. Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale	20 00
	15.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston	5 00
	16.	Miss M. Josephine Allen, Boston	5 00
	17.	Charles Dudley Warner, Hartford, Ct.	10 00
	17.	Everett O. Fisk, Boston	5 00
	18.	St. John's Church, Stamford, Ct.	10 00
	22.	Rev. Lewellyn Pratt, D.D., Norwich, Ct.	10 00
	22.	Rev. S. H. Howe, D.D., Norwich, Ct.	5 00
	22.	Gen. W. A. Aiken, Norwich, Ct.	5 00
	22.	L. W. Carroll, Norwich, Ct.	5 00
	22.	C. Royce Boss, New London, Ct.	10 00
	22.	Miss Mary Lockwood, New London, Ct.	5 00
	22.	John Nicholas Brown, Providence	25 00
	24.	Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D.D., New York	5 00
	26.	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C.	5 00
	27.	Rev. J. W. Bixler, New London, Ct.	5 00
	29.	J. L. Kilbon, Lee	2 00
	29.	Centre Congregational Church, Meriden, Ct.	10 00
	30.	W. A. Knowlton, Auburndale	5 00
	30.	Mrs. Daniel Merriman, Worcester	10 00
	31.	Prof. George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Andover	15 00
	31.	E. R. Brown, Dover, N. H.	5 00
	31.	Rev. C. H. Spalding, D.D., Cambridge	10 00
	31.	Prof. Albion W. Small, Ph.D., Chicago	5 00
	31.	Rev. F. E. Clark, D.D., Auburndale	5 00
	31.	Pres. William J. Tucker, D.D., LL.D., Hanover, N.H.	5 00
	31.	H. L. Kelley, Brown, Iowa	2 00
		Received in December	$356 00

The League: Its Aims, Etc.

Its Aim is twofold: it seeks to protect the Family from evils that threaten its integrity, and to make it more efficient in the work of society. It has no dogmas to promulgate and no pet measures to propose; but it does seek to make itself an adequate and efficient channel of influence for all who desire the stability and improvement of the Family as a social institution.

A Comprehensive View is taken of its special problem. The various subjects that belong to the Family, such as Marriage, Polygamy, Divorce, etc., are regarded as parts of one subject and therefore best treated from that point of view. And the Family is so related to the other social institutions that wise legislation, sound education, efficient religious and philanthropic work, wholesome industrial conditions, a true patriotism, and a healthy, vigorous home life are inseparably connected and dependent on each other.

The League, therefore, holds that both our national security and our social progress depend upon the proportionate care given in each of these directions; and that the comparative neglect of the Family, together with the special dangers from assaults upon its integrity, calls for unusual efforts to bring it up to its proper place in philanthropic work.

Its Method has, therefore, closely followed the definite lines which such a view requires. Through the collection of facts, by disinterested official statisticians when practicable; by the introduction of the study of the Family and of Sociology in institutions of learning and in scientific associations; through articles in reviews and other periodicals; and by public addresses, personal conferences, and private correspondence, a wide interest in the study of the Family has been developed.

Results. A few may be mentioned: the Report of our government on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe; numerous changes for the better in the Marriage and Divorce laws of many States, including the raising of the term of residence from three and six months to one year in most of the States and Territories where the lower term had existed; the better definition of the statutory causes for divorce, the regulation of procedure in divorce cases, and improved systems of marriage licenses; the careful and effective

treatment of the problem of Uniform Legislation, now apparent in the work of the Conference of Thirty-two State Commissions on the subject.

In other directions, equally good results appear. Nearly all our higher educational institutions are now giving instruction upon the Family, in many instances by those who were first interested by our work and who are among its most loyal friends. The studies in the Religious Problem of the Country Town led the way to important efforts to solve it, including the well-known Home Department of the Sunday-school — a plan for reaching the isolated Home for the study of the Bible. The larger recognition of the Home as a factor in public education and in dealing with the problems of intemperance, insanity, poverty, and crime may also be cited. In short, the outlines of a general movement in behalf of the Home are now clearly apparent in the various kinds of social philanthropy, and the people generally show a growing appreciation of the subject when fairly presented.

The Office of the League is to study the conditions of this movement, stimulate interest in it, give information through lectures, articles, and correspondence, make suggestions, incite others to do their part in it, and be a means of exchange for all who are concerned in its progress. The more we can get other persons or other agencies to do, the better do we accomplish our object. In this way we multiply our own influence and keep close to the scientific method and to those principles that are coming to be recognized as fundamental in the best philanthropic work. Both the need and the opportunity are far greater than the means at our disposal permit us to meet.

Its Friends. Attention is called to the well-known names in the list of contributors and officers, to the fact that scores of our best Colleges, Universities, Theological Seminaries, and Law Schools have sought our lectures and many more our publications; that the best of our periodicals have been opened to our papers; that our own and foreign offices have gladly aided in our investigations; and that not to mention Americans, such Englishmen as Professor Bryce, Mr. Gladstone, Sir Alfred Stephen, and Mr. Goldwin Smith have given us their sympathy and sought our aid. But best of all, perhaps, are the grateful words and eager inquiries that come from students, teachers, pastors, and home and foreign missionaries, whose studies and daily work have led them to see the need and value of this Society.

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family.

ARTICLE I. This Association shall be called the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

ART. II. Its object shall be, through the improvement of public sentiment and legislation, to protect the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce, and to secure its proper efficiency in individual and social life. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number. . . .

ART. IV. The officers of this Society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices, to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. THE LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the third Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two-thirds of the members present.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, Mr. WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST.

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY, a Corporation created by the Laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successors or assigns, the sum of.....dollars, the principal [or income, as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.